A CERTIFIED TRUE COPY

NOV 1 3 2007

ATTEST Construction on Multidistrict Litigation

OUT 25 2007

FILED

FILED

MULTIDISTRICT COURT

FILED

MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

ON

MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

ON

MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

IN RE: AVANDIA MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND

(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

MDL No. 1871

CONDITIONAL TRANSFER ORDER (CTO-1)

On October 16, 2007, the Panel transferred two civil actions to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407. See ____F.Supp.2d____ (J.P.M.L. 2007). With the consent of that court, all such actions have been assigned to the Honorable Cynthia M. Rufe.

It appears that the actions on this conditional transfer order involve questions of fact that are common to the actions previously transferred to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and assigned to Judge Rufe.

Pursuant to Rule 7.4 of the <u>Rules of Procedure of the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation</u>, 199 F.R.D. 425, 435-36 (2001), these actions are transferred under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for the reasons stated in the order of October 16, 2007, and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Cynthia M. Rufe.

This order does not become effective until it is filed in the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. The transmittal of this order to said Clerk shall be stayed 15 days from the entry thereof. If any party files a notice of opposition with the Clerk of the Panel within this 15-day period, the stay will be continued until further order of the Panel.

FOR THE PANEL:

Clerk of the Panel

NOV 1 3 2007

inasmuch as no objection is pending at this time, the stay is lifted.

PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

CLERK'S OFFICE
JUDICIAL PANEL ON
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

Page 1 of 2

IN RE: AVANDIA MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

MDL No. 1871

SCHEDULE CTO-1 - TAG-ALONG ACTIONS

DIST. DIV. C.A.#	CASE CAPTION
ARKANSAS WESTERN ARW 1 07-1088	Jimmy Mason v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al.
CALIFORNIA CENTRAL CAC 2 07-6149 CAC 5 07-1109	Alicia H. Rodriguez, ct al. v. SmithKlinc Beecham Corp. James Roland v. GlaxoSmithKline
FLORIDA SOUTHERN FLS 1 07-22434 FLS 9 07-80816	Jose Izquierdo v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al. Clifford Cartwright, et al. v. GlaxoSmithKline
ILLINOIS SOUTHERN ILS 3 07-506	Donald R. Knight v. SmithKline Beecham Corp.
INDIANA SOUTHERN INS 1 07-1202	William Bass v. GlaxoSmithKline, PLC, et al.
LOUISIANA EASTERN LAE 2 07-4013	Junita Cuccia v. GlaxoSmithKline, PLC, et al.
NEW JERSEY NJ 2 07-3291	Richard V. D'Apuzzo v. GlaxoSmithKline, PLC, et al.
NEW YORK EASTERN NYE 2 07-4016	Michael Miracolo v. GlaxoSmithKline, PLC, et al.
NEW YORK SOUTHERN NYS 1 07-4006 NYS 1 07-7879 NYS 1 07-7896 NYS 1 07-7898 NYS 1 07-7899 NYS 1 07-8137 NYS 1 07-8138 NYS 1 07-8141 NYS 1 07-8170 NYS 7 07-4636	Sheila E. Schrank v. GlaxoSmithKline, PLC, et al. Frank W. Curley v. SmithKline Beechman Corp., et al. Kim Griffin v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al. Donald Spallone v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al. Linda Madison, etc. v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al. Jesse Pitt v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al. Victor Estevez v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al. Aida Rojas v. SmithKline Beechman Corp., et al. Harvey A. Silverstein, et al. v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al. Benjamin Sarconi v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al.

Page 2 of 2

MDL No. 1871 - Schedule CTO-1 Tag-Along Actions (Continued)

DIST. DIV. C.A.#	CASE CAPTION
OHIO NORTHERN OHN 1 07-2841	Marvin Phillips, et al. v. GlaxoSmithKline, PLC
OKLAHOMA EASTERN OKE 6 07-305	Ray Donahoo, et al. v. GlaxoSmithKline, PLC
PUERTO RICO PR 3 07-1854	Maria Del-Rosario-Pagan, et al. v. GlaxoSmithKline, PLC, et al.
TENNESSEE EASTERN TNE 3 07-266	J. Terry Holland, et al. v. GlaxoSmithKline, PLC Opposed 11/8/07
TENNESSEE WESTERN TNW 2 07-2428	Lula Trass v. GlaxoSmithKline, Inc.
TEXAS EASTERN TXE 1 07-586 TXE 2 07-254	Barry Nicholas v. SmithKline Beecham Corp. Peggie Stanford, et al. v. SmithKline Beecham Corp.